

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

March 25, 2004      LB 559

verification, or whatever it's called, be required. And I think if it became necessary to challenge it, the most recently enacted law would prevail. And also if there are two provisions, one is harsh and the other one is less harsh, the one which is less harsh will be relied on, especially if it is most recently enacted.

SENATOR BOURNE: I think I agree with your assessment, but don't you think that a more prudent way of legislating would be simply to pass over LB 559 or actually maybe have Senator Synowiecki and I withdraw our amendments and your amendment with the "strike the enacting" clause be taken up, so that there is no ambiguity, so that we can provide the adequate guidance to DMV to carry out the intent of LB 559?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And by that you mean strike that place where it says "two" and make it consistent by saying "one" in both places?

SENATOR BOURNE: Well, that in part, but in a larger picture, Senator Chambers, this bill, in my opinion and with all due respect to Senator Baker, I think it came out of the Transportation and Telecommunications Committee needing some work.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR BOURNE: And all along, at several rounds of debate, we've put a lot of things into it. And I would suggest that none of us in here know exactly what's in this bill, and I'm...my concern is that we pass this over to Final Reading, we already know of one contradiction in there that doesn't provide any guidance. There very well could be others. Would you...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: True.

SENATOR BOURNE: ...you would agree to that?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: True.

SENATOR BOURNE: So based on your vast experience and knowledge